G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1904.

(Miscellaneous.)

File No. 116.

Serial Nos. 1—11.

Papers Filed.

Month April 1907.

SUBJECT.

Memorial of Ramanadhya of Sarvamangala Garakhalli, Chennapatna Taluk, praying for the cancellation of the excess assessment imposed on certain lands granted as Jodi to the Aradhya Matt.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES

LATER REFERENCES

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

OFFICE NOTE.

M.L. - 14 on
L. Dis. - 22-1-1907
File No.

SUBJECT.

In re the prayer of one Ramaradhya of Garakahalli, Chennapatna Taluk for the cancellation of the excess assessment imposed on the lands alleged to have been granted as Jodi to Aradhya Matt at the place.

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Z Letter No. 16 Dated 24th July 1906

A

On the 28th October 1904, one Rama radhaya Manager of the Ramaradhya Matt at Garaka halli in the Chennapatna Taluk Memorialized His High ness the Maharaja, stating that certain Survey Nos. in the said village which were in the undisturbed possession and enjoyment of his family for the last 70 or 80 years as Jodi Inam , were surveyed and fully assessed as " Stal Inam " during the Survey Settlement of 1902 and praying for the restoration of the long enjoyed privilege of paying the

File No. of | Muzrai Secretariat.

Kandyam on the lands endowed to Aradhya Matt. This Memorial was forwarded for report with Private Secretary's Memo No. 1116 dated 7th November 1904. S

The Memorialist represents that there at Gavakahalli by name Aradhya Matt is a Lingayet Matt, and that it has something like 1000 disciples attached to it and that under a Nirup granted by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraj Wadiyar Bahadur III, the Managers of this Matt have been empowered to have control over certain religious matters (A copy of the Niroop produced by the Petitioner has been put up for reference). slip B

The village in question and another by name Sogala in the same Taluk were granted as Sarvamanya Villages to Aliyandaru Subbaraja Arsinavaru by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraj Wadiyra Bahadur III under the authority of a Sannad dated the 16th August 1826. The villages were in the enjoyment of his family for a long time and after the demise of the last enjoyer (Chamammanniavaru) slip C

wife of Subbaraj Arsinavaru) in 1892 issueless, on the two villages were resumed to the Palace and are since ther under Government Management on behalf of the Palace. The four Survey Nos. noted in the margin have been in the enjoyment of the Matt and they form the Subject of the present correspondence.

According to Haji Beejawari-			According to Survey Beejawari			
No.	Kind	Asst. Jodi	No.	Kind	Extent	Asst
175	Dry	1-2-8 0-9-4	15b	Dry	4-10	2-12-0
561	"	4-1-4 2-0-8	161	"	5-12	4-0-0
414	Wet	1-7-4 0-0-0	349	Wet	0-39	4-0-0
		------- -------	420	Dry	1-20	1-14-0
		6-11-4 2-10-0			----------	
					12-1	12-0-0

The present claim of the petitioner is based upon a Sanad granted by the said Subbaraj Arasinavaru , under date 7th Pushya in the light fortnight of the year Vikruti 1830-31 which says that the lands under advertence should be enjoyed by the petitioner's father as Jodi Inam, the amount payable to Sarvamanyadar being specified to be 9 Hanams or Rs. 2-10-0 only. In the light

of this documentary evidence and uninterrupted long enjoyment the petitioner craves that the lands may be continued to the Matt on the Jodi paid by him viz. Rs.2-12-0 instead of Rs. 14-4-0 now imposed thereon. The petitioner cites an instance in which he says that in the case of Sogala His Highness the Maharaja was graciously pleased to order the cancellation of an excess assessment imposed on the Inam lands endowed to Someswara and other temples in the said village in the Chennapatna Taluk. vide linked file

This Memorial having been forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore Dt. that Officer has forwarded the records connected with the enquiry with his Letter No. 11 dated 3rd August 1905. The petitioner has deposed before the Amildar that as the Dakhalats now produced by him were not in his possession at the time of the Survey Settlement, he failed to represent his claims before the Survey Commissioner in sup E

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

1901 and as soon as the Dhakhalats came into his possession, he had urged upon the Survey Commissioner to consider his claims. No final orders seem to have been given on this petition. He has also produced a copy of the Sanad granted to his father by Subbaraja Arasinevaru. The Shanbhogue has deposed that he knows the petitioner and his father for the last 30 years and that he used to collect the usual Jodi of Rs. 2-10-0 from themprevious to years 1902-03. Though the fact of the lands being Jodi inam was known to him he did not moot the question with the Survey authorities and he did not make a mention of it in the ಜಮಾಬಂದಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ since none of the village accounts bore testimony to the fact that the lands were Jodi Inams. More-over, no mention of it was made in the Quit -rent Register of the Chennapatna Taluk, as the gift to the Matt was not made simultaneously with the grant of the village as Sarvamanya but it was made at a later perio

the Sarvamanyadar. But the extracts of Khate presented by the Shanbhogue go to show that previous to year 1902-03 the usual Jodi of Rs. 2-10-0 used to be recovered from the Adhyas. The Amildar in his report says that feeding and other services are being regularly conducted in the Matt. The Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Closepet Range, while submitting the records of enquiry does not support the claim of the petitioner on the grounds that there is no Firoop or expressed authority to support the statement of the petitioner and that the Samjaishi Book shows that the lands are Shala Inams which is not recognised by Government The Deputy Commissioner agrees with the opinion expressed above and says that the claim of the petitioner for Jari as well as refund of assessment seem to be untenable.

A reference was made to the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishment as to the willingness of the Palace authorities to continue

the lands enjoyed by the Matt .s Inam on the former Jodi, as was done in the case of the Sogala temples ,but he also does not recommend the continuance of the concession as the conditions attaching themselves to the latter do not seem applicable to the former. He at the same time expresses his doubt whether Sub-Inams of this nature, willed away by holders of Sarvamanya villages in perpetuity, have been recognised as valid during the Inam Settlement in the Province.

The Superintendent of Inam Settlemnts was consulted on the last point raised by the Palace Officer and he has written to the effect that such Sub-Inams have not been recognised at the Inam Settlement.

The questions now for decision are for the repayment of the excess amount that has been paid by the Memorialist since the Survey Settlement and to continue the Stala inam land

8

in the Inam village of Garakahalli, assessed at Rs 14-14-0 to the Matt subject to the payment of a Jodi of Rs. 2-10-0 hitherto paid by the Managers of the Matt and to treat the lands as " Jodi " for the maintenance of the Matt.

In this case His Highness the Maharaja has been pleased to call for a report.

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks:-

The case of the temples at Sorala and that of the Aradhya Matt at Garakahalli (now in question) are no doubt different in certain respects, as pointed out by the Palace Officer. In the first case the payment of 12 Varahas 4 Hanums on account of the lands enjoyed by certain temples was fixed in the Sannad granted by H. H. the Maharaja in 182 and so that amount was retained as Jodi under the gracious Orders of H. H. the Maharaja without rais ng it to the full assessment fixed by the Survey Depa t-ment . In the present case no mention of the Aradhya

Matt is made in the Samvat of 1826. The question therefore is whether a similar concession of keeping to the old Jodi can be shewn in the Gadkabilli case.

Strictly speaking, the land in question cannot be treated as Inam, not having been granted by the Sovereign. The Deputy Commissioner and the Inam Superintendent are therefore correct in their views that such Sub Inams or Stala Inams are not recognised by the Inam Department.

The special circumstances of the present case however seem to deserve favourable consideration. The Niroop granted by the Sarvamanyadar Subbaraj Arasinaveru in 1830-31 shews his intention that the favourable Jodi fixed by him on the lands must be for the benefit of the Aradhya Matt and the accounts shew that this low Jodi was being paid up to the year 1902-03 i.e for a period of about 70 years. The Deputy Commissioner's report shews that the Matt is being conducted

10

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

satisfactorily and people are being fed in it. The whole villages of Sogala and Garakahalli have reverted to the Palace in consequence of the Sarvamanyadars family having become extinct.

Under these circumstances it appears to be a matter for His Highness' gracious consideration whether this small concession of remitting the excess assessment of Rs. 12-4-0 per annum imposed by Survey may not be given on behalf of a charitable Institution.

In this case His Highness the Maharaja has been pleased to call for a report.

3qr

Submitted to the Dewan)
)
)
thro' the 2nd Councillor)

11th March 1907

The Inam was granted by this Sarvamanyadar in the year 1830-31 as such and its enjoyment continued down to the year 1902 The purpose

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

— , — -8-05.

for which the Inam was granted was a legitimate one, being the support of the Lingayat Matt situated in the village. The charity is being properly conducted from all accounts.

I am of the humble opinion that H.H. the Maharaja may be advised to continue the lands on Jodi Inam tenure as perennial grant.

RB Rutherfurd
12/3/07 2d Commr Dhd

12/3/07 4114 13.3.07

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Memorial of Tamaracherya of Sarvamangyadu Tarakkadu, Chamrajnagar Taluk, praying for the cancellation of the excess assessment imposed on certain lands granted as jodi to the Arachya matt.

Order.

After a careful consideration of the facts of the case, I am not disposed to take a favourable view of the strong recommendations made on behalf of the petitioners. The sub-inam cannot be recognised, particularly as no mention is made of it in the original Sannud. The petitioners may be informed that they are liable to the excess assesment imposed on the lands in question.

9/4/07

Submitted to His Highness.

I submit the file of papers relating to the Memorial of Anandhya of Sarvamanyam Sarekahully, Chennapatn Taluk, praying for the cancellation of the excess assessment imposed on the lands granted as Jodi to the Aradhya Matt, with reference to Private Secretary's Memo No.111C dated 7th November 1904.

The case has been fully discussed both by the Huzur Secretary and the 2nd Councillor in the appended office note. The village of Sarakahully now belongs to the Palace, and the Palace officer is not apparently in favor of the concession being continued as no mention of the inam in question is made in the original Sanad. It is also ascertained that such Sthal Inams are not recognized by the Inam Department. At the same time the fact that the Inam was given by the Sarvamanyamdar so long back as 1880-81, that it continued to be enjoyed as such till 1902, and that the Matt is properly maintained are considerations that lend support to the petitioner's request. The

village being an inam village belonging to the Palace, it is entirely a matter for the consideration of the Palace authorities whether to grant the petitioner's request or to recover the full survey assessment on the lands in question. I submit the matter for the orders of His Highness.

14/4/1893

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Mysore, 7th November 190-4 4

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore in the Huzroi Department, Bangalore for report.

No. 943 of 04-05.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

943

ਸਾਖੀ ਨੰਬਰ ੧ ਸਤਿਗੁਰ ਨਾਨਕ ਦੇਵ ਜੀ ਕੀ ਸਾਖੀ ਨੰਬਰ ੧

ಕಾಲಿಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಕೆಳಗಿನಂತಿವೆ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಓದಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುವಾಗ ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರಲಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೂ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಬಾರದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಉತ್ತರಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆಯಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಖಾಲಿ ಬಿಡಿ. ಅಂದಾಜು ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಯಬೇಡಿ. ಪ್ರತಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಂಕ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಒಟ್ಟು ಅಂಕಗಳು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು. ಸಮಯ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮೇಜಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಡಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎದ್ದು ಹೋಗಬಾರದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಂದಲೂ ಸಹಾಯ ಪಡೆಯಬಾರದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತವಾಗಿರಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಡಿಬಿಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆತಂಕಪಡಬೇಡಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿರಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆತ್ಮವಿಶ್ವಾಸದಿಂದಿರಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯಿರಿ. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರೆಯ

ಶ್ರೀ ಗುರುಭ್ಯೋ ನಮಃ

ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ಪರಮಗಂಭೀರ ಸ್ಯಾದ್ವಾದಾಮೋಘಲಾಂಛನ ಜೀಯಾತ್ತ್ರೈಲೋಕ್ಯನಾಥಸ್ಯ ಶಾಸನಂ ಜಿನಶಾಸನಂ ॥ ಸಕಲಭುವನಾಲಂಕಾರಭೂತ ಸಕಲಸಮಯಸಮೂಹಸಮುದ್ಭಾಸಿ

Encl 5 / 9th

To

The Dy Commr

Bangalore District

No: 1858 Rec 1 Petn & its 2 encls.
Dy 25/11/04.

Has the honour to forward herewith for favour of enquiry and early report his Regd no 943-1116/1748 dated 7th November 1904 addressed to His Highness the Maharaja by one Ramanadhya of Timmanaya Gunukuntli in the Channapatna Taluk, complaining of the increase of Kandayam

Reminder sent on the 29th April 1905

ks

on the land endowed
to the Amardhya mutt
at Ramanakuli.

B—o
23/11/24

Dpl-

Secretary
Inspn. Dept-

Ds
19/11/24

Sl 3

1905/06

From The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secy. to the Govt of Mysore -
Inungrai Deptt.

Dated 3rd August 1905

Despatched

Received.

General No.
Jud. No. 11

Enclosure No one D/file

Inung: Secy's No: 1868 of
25th November 1904.

Reports with records on the petition from one Ramaradhya complaining of the encroachment of Kandayam on the land endowed to the Aradhya Mutt at Gorakhally in the Channapatna Taluk.

Ste

646
400

Refers
Ds
3/8/05

Subd with a draft
to the Palace Ofc

Ds
- 10/8/05
Ds

M.S. 11
Estt file

Deputy Commissioner's office
Bangalore District
Dated 2nd August 1905.

From,

D Devarāja Urs Esquire
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To,

L. Anantasami Roa Esquire BA
Secretary to the Government of
Mysore
Inam Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 1858 dated 25th November 1904, forwarding for report petition from one Ramaradhya, complaining of the increase of Kandayam on the land endowed to the Aradhya matt at Gavikahalli in the Chennapatna Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of Closepet Division officer's report No. 559 dated 20/24 May 1905 giving the full facts of the case. The matt lands were enjoyed as Inam during the period when the village was in the possession of the Inamdars. After the death of the last Inamdar without any heirs the village passed to the hands of the Palace. It is possible that the original Inamdars might have shown same concession to the Aradhya mutt. But since there is no mention of this in any of the Government Inam, a quit Rent Register, the Inam ion must be purely a sthala Inam

2. Further, no document has been produced to show clearly that the land in question was regularly conferred as an Inam to the Inamdar. Under these circumstances the claim of the petioner is not acceptable.

3. The vernacular records received with Closepet Division officer's Docket No. 559 dated 20/26 May 1905 are submitted herewith for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant

D Devanna

Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore District

mm

Cabinet Docket No. 559 dated 20/24 May 1905 from the Assistant Commissioner Closepet Range to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District

---

With reference to your memo No. 320 dated 2nd December 1904, forwarding copy of Inuzrau Secretary's docket No. 1858 dated 24th November 1904 enclosing a petition from Ramaradheya Sarvamanya Gorkahalli village, Chennapatna Taluk, complaining of the increase of Kandayam on the Aradya matt lands for enquiry & report. I have the honor to state as follows:—

There is a matt called Aradhya matt at Gorkahalli, Virupakshipur Hobly, Chennapatna Taluk. It has about 1000 desciples & has been accommodating & feeding those that go there.

2. The petitioner and his ancestors as managers of the matt were enjoying certain lands, the present H. S. numbers 155, 161, 349 & 420 under the Inamdar and were paying a rent styled as jodi of 9 Hanams to as will appear from the letter produ by him written by the Inamdar to late Killay Peshkar Krishniah and Shanbhog Lingiah bearing date 1st Jesta Sudda Saptami. concess was being enjoyed

1902-03.

Survey Nos	Kind	Extent	Assessment
155	Kushk	4-10	2-12-0
161	do	5-12	4-0-0
349	wet	0-39	4-0-0
420	dry	1-20	1-4-0
		12-1	12-0-0

Giving to Inuzrai Rayavaru

Survey Nos	Kind	Kharab	Pahani	Kushk	Assessment	Jodi
175	dry	"	1	12½	1-2-8	0-9-4
551	dry	"	9	2¾	4-15-4	2-0-8
414	wet	"	8	2	1-7-4	0-10-0
			18	17½	6-11-4	2-10-0
					4-1-4	
					2-10-0	

being Assts

ancestors and petitioner himself till the death of the Inamdar & his wife & until the village was surveyed and settled after it lapsed to the Palace.

3. During the Survey the old 3 members were made into 4 & were assessed in full. Petitioner now complains that in place of Rs 2/10 jodi he was paying, he has been required to pay Rs 14/14 & prays that the concession that he had been shown to him may be continued & the extra amount levied be refunded to him.

4. From the Sukhalas produced by the petitioner Ramaradhya, it does not appear that the lands in question were given to his ancestors as jodi Inam at any time before or at the time the village was given as Inam to Subba Raj Urs The copy of the Nirroop produced by the petitioner alleged to have been issued by His Highness the late Krishna Raja Wadayar Bahadur bearing date 29th May 1828 simply shows that the Aradhyas were allowed to control over certain religious matters. There is no reference whatsoever with respect to the enjoyment of Inam. This document in no way helps the petitioner. The Survey Nos in

tion seem to have been given by

the Inamdar Subbaraya as sthala-
manyam to the petitioner's ancestors.
At no time were these lands shown
as jodi Inam in the accounts under
an arrangement or through concession
by the Inamdar, petitioners ancestors
and petitioner were enjoying the lands
paying a less amount than the
actual assessment.

5. During the Survey and Settlement,
the lands in question being Sthalamanyam
were not brought into jodidar and
Vasool Baki Pabrikas as well as to Quit
Rent Registers and were fully assessed.

6. The petitioner who now complains
of increase of assessment did nothing for
two years after settlement and slept
over his rights if he had any. His
application is barred by time. Apart
from this technical objection, there is
no niroops or other authority to support
the statement of the petitioner. On the
other hand Sanjavashi book shows
that the lands are Sthala manyam
which is not recognized by Government.

7. In these circumstances, the claim
of the petitioner for jari as well as for
refund of assessment seem to

untenable and inadmissible.

The entire papers bearing on the subject as per perust are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant

sd/ Ananda Row

Assistant Commissioner

Closepet Range

"Copy

Asst Commissioner

by Commissioner

Muz. 2]

Draft

No. 10 23-87 1916/16

GOVERNMENT OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT,

DATED BANGALORE, August 1905

FROM

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, ESQ., B.A.,
SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments,

MYSORE.

SIR,

In forwarding herewith petition Registered No. 943-1116/1748 dated 7th November 1904, addressed to H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore by one Ramaradhya of Sarvamanya Garakahalli in the Channapatna Taluk, praying for the remission of the excess assessment imposed on the lands alleged to have been attached as inam to the Aradhya Matt in the village, I am directed to state that the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District to whom the petition was referred reports in his letter No. 11, dated 3rd August 1905 that the inam in question is not Jari inam and that it was assessed as kandayem lands during the Survey Settlement as they were considered to be " Sthal " inam.

2. As the village of Garakahalli now belongs to the Mysore Palace, I am to request the favour of your opinion as to whether the Palace authorities are willing to continue the lands formerly enjoyed by the Matt as inam on the former Jodi, as prayed for by the petitioner.

3. As a report has been called for in this by His Highness the Maharaja, I am to request the fav very early reply .

4. The Vernacular records received with

Commissioner's letter under advertance are herewith forwarded for reference and re-submission.

~~I have the honor to be,~~

~~S i r,~~

~~Your most obedient servant,~~

~~S e c r e t a r~~y

5. I may add that in a similar case connected with the lands endowed to the temples in the same locality, the late Palace Controller stated in his letter No 26 dated 24th August 1903 that the Palace was willing to allow the Ethal Inams to be continued to the temples on the former footing and without the additional assessment imposed thereon. The Govt. order No 722-6 dated 17th September 1903 was thereupon passed, a printed copy of which is herewith enclosed for your information.

I have &c

M. 201

The Palace Office,

Mysore.

Dated 11th June 1906.

No: 158/1 Original Niroop & 12 Enclosures = 26 papers

From,

B.Ramakrishna Row, Esq.,

Officer in charge of the Palace Estts.,

Mysore.

To,

L.Anantasami Rao, Esq.,

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Muzroi Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No:1023 of the 25th August 1905 regarding the remission prayed for by one Ramaradhya of Sarvamanya Garakahalli, Channapatana Taluk, Bangalore District, of the excess assessment imposed on the lands alleged to have been attached as Inam to the Aradhya Matt in the Village, and in reply to state that I have caused as far as possible a complete search to be made in the records of the Palace Office for references bearing on the subject. From the papers available here, it will be seen that the Niroop of His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur declaring the grant of the Villages of Garakahalli and Sogala, Chennapatna Taluk, as Sarvamanya to Aliyandar Subbaraj Urs is dated 15th August 1826 A.D. While it shows 12 Varahas and 4 Phanams referred to in para (1) of Govt. Pro.No:722-6/ Muz.F.4-1903 of 17th September 1903 under Baja Bab of the Inamti, no mention whatever is therein made of the Aradhya Inam in question. The conditions attaching themselves to the former do not therefore seem applicable to the latter.

2. Petitioner, however, produces a Sannad granted by the said Subbaraj Urs under date 7th Pushya in the light fortnight of the year Vikruti ,1830-31 A.D., which allows the land under notice to one Ramaradhya as Jodi Inam , the amount payable being said to be 9 Phanams only. It is not known whether Sub-Inams of this nature willed away by holders of Sarvamanya Villages , in perpetuity have been recognized as valid during the Inam Settlement in the Province. I beg to request the favor of your kindly enlightening me on this subject and of letting me know at the same time whether the area of the Inam the Aradhya refers to according to Survey is in any way more than the old Bijavari thereof and if so, what the difference amounts to.

This is in the File herewith.

3. The Niroop above alluded to is enclosed in original for your perusal and return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

B Ramakrishnaiah 11/6/08

Officer in charge of the

Palace Establishments.

T.L.

Compd.

916

No. 5836 dt 21.6.06.
Secy/I+I file

To

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements
in Mysore

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Palace Office's letter no 158 dated the 11th instant, together with all its enclosures in original, including the Samad, regarding the remission prayed for by one Ramanathya of Lakkamanya Gowda -halli in the Channa-
-patna Taluk

request the favour of
your opinion on the point
referred to in the 1st
para of the letter.

2. The information
required by the Palace
on the 2 points noted
Officer in the 2nd para
of the letter may also
be kindly furnished
with reference to the Settlement
papers &c

3. The favour of
an early reply is requested.

I have &c

Sd/- 12/12/06

Secretary to Govt
Municipal Dept

Sd/-
12/6/06

Hc

1906

Papers
Ls
3/7/06

No: 46

From
The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Muzrai Department.

Dated 3rd
Despatched 4"
Received
General No.
No. 143

} Jnty.

Enclosure No. 1 File of papers.

Stating that Aradhyadanam
in Gorakally Lawanamyam
in Channapatna Taluk, was
not noticed by this Depart-
-ment and as such no opinion
can be given regarding it.

No. 143
1/71 file

Inam Superintendent's office
Bangalore dated 3rd July 1906

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements
in Mysore

To,

The Secretary to the Government of
Mysore, Muzrai Department

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 58
dated 21st June 1906, I have the honor to state
that as the Aradhya Inam was granted by
the Inamdar of the Sarwamanya Gara
in the Chennapatna Taluk, it was not
noticed by this Department and therefore,
I am not able to give you any opinion
in the matter referred to in para 1 of your
letter.

2 The file of papers received with the
letter under reply are, herewith, returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Supt of Inam Settlements in

98

Muzrai Secretariat, File No. of 190

No 306 Exc. 1° P
D. 16/11/0

D. 2/11/06
To

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements
in Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your
letter no 143 dated the 3rd
July 1906, regarding the Arishya
Inam in the Sannamangala
Karakuchalli village in the
Channapatna Taluk, I am to
again invite your attention
to para 2 of this office letter
no 5836 dated the 21st ultimo,
and to request that you will
be so kind as to furnish
information on the 2 points
referred to therein —

The Commissioner

MGCPB—3,500—15-10-04.

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

together with the Surveyed and the Palace Officer's letter in original are again forwarded herewith.

2 hours dt 13/7/06

Secretary

13/7/06 Muzrai Dept

8 16

8 9

He

1906

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Muzrai Department

Dated 24th
Despatched 28th } July
Received

General No. 16
No.

Enclosure No. one file

528

Ks
2877/06

Stating that Inams willed by the holders of whole Inam villages are not recognized and registered in the Department.

No 16
" one file

Inam Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 24th July 1906.

To,

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore.
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 306 307 of the 16th July 1906, I have the honor to state that Inams granted by the holders of whole villages have not been recognized at the Inam Settlement. When the Inam itself is not recognized or even registered, it is not possible to say what the old and the present Bijawaris are.

2. The file of papers received with the above, are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore.

4/18

V-S

No: 34 of 1906-07. The Palace Office,

Mysore. Dated 8th February 190[illegible].

Rupees
21
18/2/07

From,

B. Ramakrishna Row, Esq.,

Officer in charge of the Palace Estts.

Mysore.

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Muzrai Department,

Bangalore.

Vide No. 4992-8/25407

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to cause the return of the Niroop sent in original with this Office No. 158 dated 11th June 1906, if it is no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M Ramakrishna Row

Officer in charge of the,

21/2/07 Palace Estts.

Draft as per H H's orders

Mysore SC 11

2P 19 4

No. 4990 D/25/4/07

Endorsement granted to Ramaradhya of Sarvamanyam Garakahalli village, Channapatna Taluk, with reference this Memorial no 1748/943, dated addressed to H H the Maharaja 29th October 1904, praying for the cancellation of the excess assessment imposed on certain lands granted as Jodi to the Aradhya Matt at Garakahalli

---

After a careful consideration of the facts of the case, the Govt of H H the Maharaja are not prepared to recognise the sub-inam said to have been the Sarvamanyadan

As

Matt, particularly because no mention thereof is made in the original Sanad of 1826, granted by H. H. the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeir Bahadur III. The Memorialist is accordingly informed that the Matt is liable to pay the excess assessment imposed on the lands in question.

By Order,

14/4/07
Secretary

H.H.'s orders)

No. 4991 Ins VPP. 18/4/07

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Dt., with reference to Corr.ce ending with his letter No. 11, dated 3rd August 1905. The Vernacular Records read with that Corr.ce are herewith returned.

By Order,

14/4/07
Secretary.

No. 4992 & Misc. Post (Bo. Rely.)

Copy to the Officer in charge of,

the Palace Establishments,
Mysore, with refce to corr.
ending with his letter No. 11 th
June 1906. The ~~Maharaja's Private~~
~~Secretary to the~~ original Memo
received with that
correce ~~is~~ herewith
returned —

By order,

19/4/07
Secretary.

DS
No 499

Copy to the Supdt of Main
Settlements in Mysore, with refce
to corre ending with his ~~letter~~
No 16 dated 24 th July 1906.

By Order,

Secretary.

DS
18/4/07